

Marc J. Randazza, #027861  
 RANDAZZA LEGAL GROUP, PLLC  
 4974 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 100  
 Las Vegas, NV 89118  
 Tel: (702) 420-2001  
 ecf@randazza.com

David S. Gingras, #021097  
 GINGRAS LAW OFFICE, PLLC  
 4802 E. Ray Road, #23-271  
 Phoenix, AZ 85044  
 Tel.: (480) 264-1400  
 Fax: (480) 248-3196  
 David@GingrasLaw.com

John C. Burns, MBE# 66462\*  
 Burns Law Firm  
 P.O. Box 191250  
 Saint Louis, MO 63119  
 Tel: 314-329-5040  
 Fax: 314-282-8136  
 TBLF@pm.me

Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
 TPG Communications, LLC and Jordan Conradson

*\*pro hac vice*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

TGP Communications, LLC, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Jack Sellers, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-01925-JJT

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT  
 OF MOTION FOR LIMITED EARLY  
 DISCOVERY**

Plaintiffs TGP Communications, LLC d/b/a The Gateway Pundit and Jordan Conradson file this Reply in support of their motion seeking leave to conduct limited early discovery.

To say that the Plaintiffs are surprised by the Government’s response would be an understatement. This Motion is about trying to put an end to actions which the parties and the Court should find intolerable. The Defendants *seem* to agree, but seem to prefer to use this motion to take cheap shots at the Plaintiffs. While the parties are expected to be at odds with each other in an adversary system, this should not preclude collaboration when necessary and proper. Plaintiffs are just as disappointed as they are surprised.

TGP discovered the problem and was proactive about it. This is relevant to the instant case because, in large part, the Government relies upon biased and dishonest third parties’ hearsay allegations about alleged “threats.” Clearly, the Government’s counsel relied on third party reports, because where the Plaintiffs have actual evidence, they can clearly disprove the claims made by those who appear to have misled the Government’s counsel. For example, nobody swears under oath that “Plaintiff Conradson personally scared Secretary of State Katie Hobbs with his aggressive tactics on two reported occasions.” *See* Dkt. No. 33 at 2. This is because it would be perjury. Video of the event shows that the Government’s counsel was misled.<sup>1</sup> Reporters asking public officials for comment, and public officials giving them nothing but a picture of the back of their head is commonplace in journalism. Sec. Hobbs does not like The Gateway Pundit, so she

---

<sup>1</sup> *See* Jim Hoft, “Why Are You Working So Hard to Shut the Audit Down? What Are You Hiding” – TGP Reporter Confronts AZ Secretary of State Katie Hobbs — Katie Hobbs Runs! (VIDEO)”, THE GATEWAY PUNDIT (May 6, 2021), available at: <https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/05/working-hard-shut-audit-hiding-tgp-reporter-confronts-az-secretary-state-katie-hobbs-katie-hobbs-runs-video/>; Jordan Conradson, “MUST SEE VIDEO: Arizona Secretary of State Katie Hobbs RUNS From TGP’s Jordan Conradson AGAIN — Won’t Answer Questions At Free and Fair Elections Event”, THE GATEWAY PUNDIT (March 23, 2022), available at: <https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2022/03/must-see-video-arizona-secretary-state-katie-hobbs-runs-tgps-jordan-conradson-wont-answer-questions-free-fair-elections-event/>.

refuses to acknowledge its reporter. That is her right. It is not, however, the same thing as a “threat” or a “danger.” This Court should not be misled by such dishonesty.

All of the other claims of “death threats” are supported by nothing more than The Gateway Pundit’s competition, Reuters, dutifully reprinting press releases issued by people who either dislike TGP, or think they are going to get rich suing TGP. This is not “journalism,” and it is not “seeking the truth.” Yet, the Government relies on it as if it were a proven fact, and unfortunately, this Court gave this some credit already. This was wrong, and this Court should not give these unfounded and untested claims any credit. Not a single one of these “threats” was investigated by a single reporter seeking to get to the truth – they simply wished to discredit TGP.

Meanwhile, the only threats that are actually in the record are those that TGP found, and that TGP is trying to investigate. Will that investigation exonerate TGP from this accusation? TGP can not guarantee that one way or the other – but TGP is doing what Reuters never sought to do – actually get to the truth of the matter, no matter where that trail may lead – even if it leads somewhere that is not to TGP’s advantage.

The Government is correct that the threats related to this Motion occurred post-hearing. That does not make them irrelevant. Were they the same bad actors who issued threats in the past? We don’t know. Were they new bad actors? Were they sent by the Defendants themselves, or their agents, to discredit TGP? TGP ranks the probability of that as very low, but it is at least *possible*. Were they sent by an errant employee of the undersigned’s law firm? Even that might be possible. It would be mortifying and that person would be fired immediately, but we simply do not know. We need to know.

With respect to the alleged threats against Mr. Liddy, if they truly exist: They were brought to TGP’s attention by law enforcement, in conjunction with conversations with

Mr. Liddy (as a response to TGP trying to meet and confer on this motion). TGP was told these threats are on TGP’s comment section,<sup>2</sup> and then when TGP asked where they could be found, so they could be deleted, everyone went silent. Why? Either someone is not being entirely forthcoming, or someone wants this kind of material to remain in the comments section, unable to be found.

The government argues “the supposition that the comment disclosing Judge Tuchi’s address, and the threats made against Mr. Liddy were merely attempts to discredit The Gateway Pundit in light of their present litigation against the County is pure speculation.” Of course it is! It is just as speculative as assuming that the supposed threats came from TGP supporters – and this Court relied on *that* speculation to deny TGP important Constitutional relief. Why should TGP not be permitted to rely on suspicion to at least engage in discovery, to find out who these terrible people are, and why are they doing these terrible things? Why isn’t the response a resounding “let’s go get ‘em!”?

This Court should permit the Plaintiffs to gather this information – and quickly, before the information expires. The longer the wait, the more likely it will be that these wrongdoers can cover their tracks.

With respect to the Government’s request that if the relief is granted, the information be turned over to Defendants’ counsel and law enforcement – Plaintiffs are not against that. Had the Defense counsel agreed to meet and confer about this motion, rather than ignoring requests to do so, this may have been in the request for relief.

With respect to gaining clearance from law enforcement before contacting the individuals, the Plaintiffs tried multiple times to obtain law enforcement’s position on this motion as well, but they simply ignored each and every request for their position.

---

<sup>2</sup> See **Exhibit 1**, email from U.S. Marshals.

Accordingly, the Court should not agree that law enforcement should be permitted to stop TGP from reaching out to these individuals to interrogate them on their motivations for their awful actions. TGP will, however, gladly turn their information over to law enforcement, whether these individuals claim to be friend or foe – TGP does not tolerate this conduct. *See* Jim Hoft, “Friendly Reminder: The Gateway Pundit Is a ‘Zero Tolerance for Threats’ Zone,” THE GATEWAY PUNDIT (December 6, 2022), Dkt. No. 30-2.

Dated: December 13, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Marc J. Randazza

Marc J. Randazza, #027861  
RANDAZZA LEGAL GROUP, PLLC  
4974 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 100  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89118

David S. Gingras, #021097  
GINGRAS LAW OFFICE, PLLC  
4802 E. Ray Road, #23-271  
Phoenix, AZ 85044

John C. Burns, MBE# 66462\*  
BURNS LAW FIRM  
P.O. Box 191250  
Saint Louis, MO 63119

Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
TPG Communications, LLC and  
Jordan Conradson

*\*pro hac vice*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on December 13, 2022, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF. I further certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document being served via transmission of Notices of Electronic Filing generated by CM/ECF.

/s/ Marc J. Randazza  
MARC J. RANDAZZA